

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 07 2006

PATENT  
Attorney Docket No.: TVW/APP49US  
Serial No. 10/675,918  
Page 4 of 7**REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 3-13 are currently pending, of which claims 12 and 13 were previously withdrawn. Applicants cancel claims 2, 10, and 14, without prejudice or disclaimer, and amend claim 1 to incorporate the subject matter of cancelled claims 2 and 10. Applicants have reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on March 9, 2006, and the references cited therewith. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all claims in view of the following remarks.

***Request for Correction of Attorney Docket Number***

Please change the attorney docket number to "TVW/APP49US".

***Claims 1-11 and 14 are Patentable over §112, Paragraph 2***

Claims 1-11 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, paragraph two, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicants regard as the invention. In particular, the Office Action stated that there was insufficient antecedent basis in claims 1 and 14 and rejected claims 2-11 for depending on the rejected base claim.

Claim 1 is amended to incorporate the subject matter of cancelled claim 2 and claim 14 is cancelled. As a result, Applicants respectfully submit that these rejections are moot and should be withdrawn.

***Claims 1, 3-11, and 14 are Patentable under §101***

Claims 1, 3-11 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 1 is amended to incorporate the subject matter of cancelled claim 2 and claim 14 is cancelled. The Office Action noted that claim 2 included a useful, concrete, and tangible result. As a result, Applicants respectfully submit that these rejections are moot and should be withdrawn.

PATENT  
Attorney Docket No.: TVW/APP49US  
Serial No. 10/675,918  
Page 5 of 7

**Claims 1-8, 10-11 and 14 are Patentable over MacFarlane and Burkett under §103**

Claims 1-8, 10-11, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2001/0042081 A1 for MacFarlane et al. ("MacFarlane") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,671,853 to Burkett et al. ("Burkett").

According to MPEP §2143, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under §103, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

The combination of MacFarlane and Burkett fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, because the combination does not teach or suggest all the elements of the claimed invention, as amended. For example, the combination fails to teach or suggest resolving the style information by reducing the number of style properties, deleting style rules, and simplifying style dependencies in the style information, as claimed.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "wherein said resolving said style information comprises two or more of: reducing the number of style properties, deleting style rules, and simplifying style dependencies in said style information."

Neither MacFarlane nor Burkett teach or suggest deleting style rules or simplifying style dependencies in the style information, as claimed. Clearly, attributes are different from rules or dependencies. By reducing the number of style properties, deleting style rules, and simplifying style dependencies in said style information, the claimed invention goes further to provide more efficient and compact resolved style information. By contrast, MacFarlane merely discloses removing unused style attributes. (See MacFarlane, page 2, paragraph [0032], page 5,

PATENT  
Attorney Docket No.: TVW/APP49US  
Serial No. 10/675,918  
Page 6 of 7

paragraph [0093].) However, the number of style properties may be reduced even when one of the eliminated properties is used. Burkett merely discloses "serializing" or "flattening" the DOM tree structure, which is unrelated to the claimed resolution of style information. (See Burkett, col. 3, lines 1-9.)

Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over the combination of MacFarlane and Burkett under §103.

Claims 3-9 and 11 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1 and, thus, inherit the patentable subject matter of claim 1, while adding additional elements and further defining elements. Therefore, claims 3-9 and 11 are also patentable over the combination of MacFarlane and Burkett under §103 for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

The rejection of claims 2, 10, and 14 is moot, because these claims are cancelled.

***Claim 9 is Patentable over MacFarlane, Burkett, and Hill under §103***

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over MacFarlane in view of Burkett as applied to claim 1 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,023,714 to Hill et al. ("Hill").

For the reasons given above and because claim 9 depends from claim 1, claim 9 is patentable over the combination of MacFarlane and Burkett under §103. Hill fails to teach or suggest resolving the style information by reducing the number of style properties, deleting style rules, and simplifying style dependencies in the style information, as claimed. By contrast, Hill discloses new attributes and extensions to style sheet attributes. (See Hill, col. 7, lines 18-50.) Therefore, claim 9 is patentable over the combination of MacFarlane, Burkett and Hill under §103.

PATENT  
Attorney Docket No.: TVW/APP49US  
Serial No. 10/675,918  
Page 7 of 7

### CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and passage of the claims to allowance. If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Lea A. Nicholson or Eamon J. Wall at (732) 530-9404 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 7, 2006



Lea A. Nicholson  
Registration No. 48,346  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP  
595 Shrewsbury Avenue, Suite 100  
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702  
Telephone: 732-530-9404  
Facsimile: 732-530-9808